



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

He  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/033,499	12/27/2001	Gary Wayne Reis	REIS 0101	8403

24507            7590            10/01/2002  
BROOKS & FILLBACH  
5010 NO. PARKWAY CALABASAS  
SUITE 104  
CALABASAS, CA 91302-3913

EXAMINER	
CARTER, MONICA SMITH	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER

3722

DATE MAILED: 10/01/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

S.M.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/033,499	REIS, GARY WAYNE
	Examiner Monica S. Carter	Art Unit 3722

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 December 2001.

2a) This action is FINAL.                  2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some \* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.

3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 3 .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-6, 8-14 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McDonald (5,156,898) in view of Maude, Sr. (5,013,070).

McDonald discloses a rectangular sheet (10- as seen in figure 4) of foldable material having an upper side and a reverse side, the sheet having a plurality of substantially parallel primary folds (12) forming a series of panels foldably arranged one atop another; one or more secondary folds (14) in the sheet substantially perpendicular to the plurality of substantially parallel primary folds forming sub-panels which are foldably perpendicular to the primary folds; wherein one of the sub-panels forms a front cover (20) of the booklet and one of the sub-panels forms a rear cover (22) of the booklet.

McDonald discloses the claimed invention except for the specific arrangement and/or content of indicia (printed matter) set forth in the claims. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide any desired indicia in the booklet since it would only depend on the intended use of the assembly and the desired information to be displayed. Further, it has been held that

when the claimed printed matter is not functionally related to the substrate it will not distinguish the invention from the prior art in terms of patentability. *In re Gulack* 217 USPQ 401, (CAFC 1983). The fact that the content of the printed matter placed on the substrate may render the device more convenient by providing an individual with a specific type of booklet does not alter the functional relationship. Mere support by the substrate for the printed matter is not the kind of functional relationship necessary for patentability. Thus, there is no novel and unobvious functional relationship between the printed matter and the substrate which is required for patentability. Further, Maude, Sr. discloses a golf score card (10) comprising a rectangular sheet (as seen in figure 1) containing graphic depictions of the holes of a golf course including "the general layout of the golf hole, from tee box to green, with the optional illustration of bunkers, hazards, and other obstacles." (see col. 1, lines 60-68). Maude, Sr. also discloses that "other suitable course information can be provided, such as shown at 22, to assist the player and scorer using the golf score card 10." (see col. 3, lines 10-12). As seen in figure 1, a matrix (12) is provided to keep score on a hole-by-hole basis for several players. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify McDonald's invention to include graphic depictions of a golf course on the foldable sheet, as taught by Maude, Sr., to provide a convenient, portable device that gives a golfer a quick reference of the golf course and enables scoring recordation.

Regarding claims 3 and 11, it would have been obvious to provide information on both the upper and reverse side of the sheet, since it has been held that mere duplication of

essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. *St. Regis Paper Co. v. Bemis Co.*, 193 USPQ 8.

Regarding claims 5 and 13, McDonald, as modified by Maude Sr., discloses that the substrate is markable (see Maude, Sr. col. 1, lines 54-59).

Regarding claims 6 and 14, it would have been advantageous and obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to provide the booklet dimensioned to be insertable within clothing pockets, since such a modification would have involved a mere change in the size of a component. A change in size is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art. *In re Rose*, 105 USPQ 237 (CCPA 1955). Further, making the booklet pocket-sized enables the golfer to easily carry the booklet along as he/she plays the game.

Regarding claims 8 and 16, the primary folds are substantially evenly spaced (as seen in McDonald, figure 4).

Regarding claims 9-12, see the above rejections to claim 1.

3. Claims 7 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maude, Sr. in view of McDonald and further in view of Campbell (Des. 378,358). Maude, Sr., as modified by McDonald, discloses the claimed invention except for a sheet of paper being inserted inside the folded form of the booklet, the insert containing promotional materials and information and instructions on the use of the booklet.

Campbell discloses a golf score card having a separable advertising panel. Inherently, it would be necessary to retain the panel once it is attached to prevent littering on the golf course. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify McDonald's invention to include providing a promotional insert, as taught by Campbell, to promote different businesses and/or services to golf players.

### ***Conclusion***

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Brechtel (3,552,290), Bodine et al. (4,666,157), Tattershall (4,783,071), McDonald (5,358,761) and Perttunen et al. (5,882,763).
  
5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Monica S. Carter whose telephone number is (703) 305-0305. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday (8:00 AM - 5:30 PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrea L. Wellington can be reached on (703) 308-2159. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9302 for regular communications and (703) 872-9303 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1148.

*Monica S. Carter*  
Monica S. Carter  
Examiner  
Art Unit 3722  
September 25, 2002